

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated June 25, 2008. In view of the foregoing amendments and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By the above amendment, claims 13, 18 and 27 are amended. Thus, claims 13, 14, 16-22 and 24-30 are currently pending in the present application.

Initially, on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 22 and 24-29 are allowed.. The Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter is sincerely appreciated, and, as will be explained below, the remaining claims should also now be in condition for allowance.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the language of claims 18 and 27 lacks antecedent basis in the specification as originally filed. Accordingly, each of claims 18 and 27 has been amended to change "a volume resistivity of not smaller than 10^{-8} (Ω -cm)" to -- a volume resistivity of not smaller than 10^8 (Ω -cm) --. As noted by the Examiner, the revised language has clear support in the original disclosure. Thus, the objection to the specification is now clearly obviated.

Next, on pages 2-3 of the Office Action, claims 21 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Examiner takes the position that the language "halogen containing gas" does not appear to provide adequate support for the breadth of the recitation. However, lines 5-12 of page 61 of the originally filed specification recite "halogen-containing gas such as HBr." Thus, it is clear that HBr was listed only as an example of a halogen-containing gas and that the invention was not intended to be limited to this particular gas. Accordingly, it is submitted that the generically recited

“halogen-containing gas” of dependent claims 21 and 30 is adequately supported in the originally filed specification.

Next, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 13, 14 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In response, independent claim 13 has been amended to incorporate the Examiner’s proposed language set forth on page 4 of the Office Action. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is now clearly obviated.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to enter the above amendments and pass this case to issue.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant’s undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitsuo SAITOH et al.

By: /Michael S. Huppert/
2008.09.25 16:13:37 -04'00'
Michael S. Huppert
Registration No. 40,268
Attorney for Applicants

MSH/kjf
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 25, 2008